



Proceedings from the international seminar "REDD+ expectations and experiences"

Kamelarczyk, Kewin Bach Friis; Theilade, Ida; Nathan, Iben; Saito, Moeko; Kleine, Michael

Publication date:
2011

Document version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Kamelarczyk, K. B. F., Theilade, I., Nathan, I., Saito, M., & Kleine, M. (Eds.) (2011). *Proceedings from the international seminar "REDD+ expectations and experiences"*. Forest & Landscape, University of Copenhagen. Working Papers Forest & Landscape No. 67/2011



Proceedings from the international seminar "REDD+ expectations and experiences"

WORKING PAPERS FOREST & LANDSCAPE

67 / 2011



MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF DENMARK
DANIDA | INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION



Compiled and edited by
Kewin Kamelarczyk, Ida Theilade, Iben Nathan,
Moeko Saito and Michael Kleine



Titel

Proceedings from the international seminar "REDD+ expectations and experiences"
Eigtveds Pakhus, Copenhagen 14 September 2011

Compiled and edited by

Kevin Kamelarczyk, Ida Theilade, Iben Nathan, Moeko Saito and Michael Kleine

Publisher

Forest & Landscape Denmark

ISBN

978-87-7903-559-1

DTP

Melita Jørgensen

Citation

Kamelarczyk, K., Theilade, I., Nathan, I., Saito, M. and Kleine, M. 2011. Proceedings from the international seminar "REDD+ expectations and experiences". 2011. Forest & Landscape Working Papers no 67

Citation allowed with clear source indication

Written permission is required if you wish to use Forest & Landscape's name and/or any part of this report for sales and advertising purposes.

Electronic

www.SL.life.ku.dk

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Opening session – Setting the scene	4
3. Thematic session I – Measuring, Reporting and Verification	6
Main experiences in relation to REDD+	7
Expectations to REDD+	7
Research and knowledge gaps	7
Main challenges and key controversial issues	8
4. Thematic session II – Biodiversity co-benefits	9
Main experiences in relation to REDD+	9
Expectations to REDD+	9
Research and knowledge gaps	10
Main challenges and key controversial issues	10
5. Thematic session III – Livelihood co-benefits	12
Main experiences in relation to REDD+	12
Expectations to REDD+	13
Main challenges and knowledge gaps	13
6. Closing session	14
Thematic session I – Measuring, Reporting and Verification	14
Thematic session II – Biodiversity co-benefits	15
Thematic session III – Livelihood co-benefits	15
Appendix I	17
Joint morning session (Plenary room III)	17
Thematic afternoon sessions	18

1. Introduction

To mark the International Year of the Forest a one day seminar “REDD+ expectations and experiences” was held in Copenhagen 14 September 2011 at Eigtveds Pakhus. The aim of the seminar was to examine critical issues that had arisen in the international effort to design and implement mechanisms for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Initially put forward as a relatively simple means of mitigating climate change by avoiding deforestation, the expectations associated with REDD+ have steadily increased. At the same time, it has become increasingly apparent that building a national and international REDD+ mechanism is a lengthy and complex process.

A series of keynote speakers from different international organizations involved in REDD+ including the UN-REDD Programme, the World Bank, The Norwegian Forest and Climate Initiative, and representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations and Indigenous Peoples were invited to introduce the main topics of the seminar.

The seminar brought together more than 100 international and Danish researchers, practitioners, and students with an interest in REDD+. The participants compared expectations associated with REDD+ with experiences gained from pilot forest carbon initiatives and discussed ways forward. The seminar was organized by the Technical Advisory Service (TAS) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark together with the International Union of Forest Research Organisations (IUFRO), and Forest & Landscape Denmark (FLD) of the University of Copenhagen.

The proceedings are comprised by five main sections related to the main sessions of the seminar: 1. Opening session – Setting the Scene; 2. Thematic session I – Measuring, Reporting and Verification; 3. Thematic session II – Biodiversity co-benefits; 4. Thematic session III – Livelihoods co-benefits. The sections related to the thematic sessions provide an overview of the sessions’ content and a summary of findings along the headings of: Main experiences in relation to REDD+; Expectations to REDD+; Research and knowledge gaps and; Main challenges and key controversial issues. The full seminar programme is found in the appendix.

Presentations given by speakers during the seminar are found at the following website: http://www.sl.life.ku.dk/English/outreach_publications/Conferences/papers_conferences/redd.aspx, Links to presentations are given in the subsequent sections to which the presentations are associated.

2. Opening session – Setting the scene

The opening session provided a number of key-note speakers (follow links for presentations). Mike Speirs chaired the session:

- Niels Elers Koch, Forest & Landscape Denmark. Opening remarks.
- Ib Petersen, State secretary for Development Policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.
- Andreas Tveteraas, The Norwegian Climate and Forest Initiative.
- Yemi Katarere, UN-REDD Programme. Title: REDD+: A Unique Opportunity?
- Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank. Title: “Global Demands - local needs” - widening the scope of forest-based climate mitigation options in the tropics.
- Joji Carino, United Nations Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity. Title: Indigenous peoples’ experiences and expectations on REDD+.
- Steven Panfil, REDD+ Initiative at Conservation International. Title: Linking REDD+ projects to emerging national REDD+ programs.

The seminar was opened by Niels Elers Koch, President of the International Union of Forest Research Organisations (IUFRO) and director of Forest and Landscape (KU-LIFE). He welcomed the close to 100 registered participants and briefly outlined critical issues in REDD+, notably raising the main questions to be addressed during the seminar: how to monitor, report and verify carbon emissions from forests and how to achieve co-benefits from REDD+ in terms of improved livelihoods and better conservation and management of biodiversity. These themes were also picked up in the opening remarks by Ib Petersen, the State Secretary for Development Policy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He also welcomed the participants and noted that Danida grants had been allocated through “fast start climate finance” for a number of REDD+ initiatives since 2008, following the approval of the Bali action plan of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The first keynote speech was by Andreas Tveteraas, senior adviser at the Norwegian Government’s International Climate and Forest Initiative. He emphasized that although progress has been made since REDD+ emerged on the international agenda, the UNFCCC negotiations are moving slowly. Thus partnerships for reducing emissions from deforestation and degrada-

tion are of considerable significance and the Norwegian agreements with Brazil, the countries of the Congo Basin, Indonesia and Guyana were highlighted. The challenges of incorporating REDD+ into national low carbon development strategies were illustrated with the example of the results framework agreed in Guyana.

Similar concerns about progress, expectations and experiences were discussed by Yemi Katarere, the head of the secretariat at the UN REDD Program. His keynote speech included an overview of the complex institutional arrangements for global REDD+ processes and highlighted several concerns about the re-centralization of forest management, the problems of forest governance and tenure security and the importance of keeping livelihoods in focus. Is REDD+ a unique opportunity? -he asked. In so far as forests have been brought back to the centre of the stage, it probably is a unique opportunity.

Joji Carino, adviser with the Indigenous Peoples International Centre for Policy Research and Education and member of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, discussed the concerns faced by indigenous communities around the world in their efforts to ensure that REDD+ mechanisms recognize their rights as well as effective participation and fair benefits. She noted the criticisms of REDD+, but also emphasized opportunities for indigenous communities and forest dwellers. Examples from the Philippines and Nicaragua illustrated the importance of respect for indigenous peoples' rights in the design of REDD+ strategies and in improved forest management in general.

Gerhard Dieterle, senior forest adviser at the World Bank, painted a broad picture of the challenges facing forest based climate mitigation. He drew attention to the importance of reducing emissions as playing a central role in the abatement of greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries. He also explored a series of issues arising in conjunction with the move towards "climate smart agriculture" (to feed 9 billion people), in addressing energy demand and supply trends, in the proliferation of land grabs for bio-fuel production and export crops, in the collaboration with agribusiness through commodity roundtables, in promoting sustainable forest management through consumer demand and through certification schemes and in the context of the potential for multiple benefits of forestry practices. Finally Steven Panfil, REDD+ adviser with Conservation International (CI), explored the progress and emerging challenges from REDD+ projects around the world. He stressed the progress that has been made in terms of designing and agreeing on methodologies for voluntary and later verifiable carbon standards to be applied in carbon markets. He also pointed out that the REDD+ share of the compliance carbon markets remains minimal, but interest is growing and agreed social and environmental safeguards are very important for potential project developers and investors. He also outlined the carbon accounting problems that have been examined through pilot REDD+ projects supported by Conservation International in Peru and elsewhere. Rigorous carbon accounting and systems to monitor social and environmental performance of REDD+ schemes are essential.

3. Thematic session I – Measuring, Reporting and Verification

The session examined the challenges associated with MRV (measuring/monitoring, reporting and verification) of forests in the context of carbon management, biodiversity and livelihoods co-benefits. Four speakers from different institutions were invited to present:

- Danilo Molicone from the UN-REDD Programme/FAO. Title of presentation: *Information, Monitoring and MRV in the context of REDD+*.
- Herizo Andrianandrasana from Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust Madagascar. Title of presentation: *Effectiveness of local REDD+ monitoring in Madagascar*.
- Klaus Dons from Forest & Landscape Denmark. Title of presentation: *Direct and indirect approaches to monitor forest degradation in dry forests in Tanzania*.
- Louis Verchot from Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). Title of presentation: *Accounting for carbon emissions from tropical land use change: constraints with emissions factors required to operationalise IPCC equations*.

Michael Kleine from the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO) facilitated the session. A wide array of topics were presented, ranging from regulatory issues and definitions in the REDD mechanism to specific IPCC requirements for carbon measurements to local community monitoring and approaches to quantify forest degradation. The wealth of information provided is in the following summarised under four headlines.

Main experiences in relation to REDD+

MRV in the context of UNFCCC/IPCC refers to Measuring, Reporting and Verification of carbon emissions. Related to forests there are five carbon pools to be measured with an additional element on wood products likely to be added in future. MRV should not be confused with monitoring, reporting and verification which is a much broader concept addressing proxies of reduced forest carbon emissions, such as forest area (=deforestation), forest degradation and all co-benefits such as biodiversity and livelihoods. Monitoring relates mainly to the initial phases of REDD+ associated with sub-national and pilot project levels. A complete MRV system (with carbon measurement as main focus) will have to be in place in order for countries to enter the ultimate third stage of REDD+ implementation. In principle everything in the UNFCCC negotiations has already been decided in relation to MRV. However, as examples from Brazil and Indonesia show,

donors are ready to provide funding for REDD+ even before a complete MRV is being implemented, as long as some kind of result-based monitoring is in place.

Expectations to REDD+

Research on the effectiveness of measuring and monitoring forest parameters (including biomass, level of degradation, biomass removals etc.) through local communities suggests that in principle such measurements are equally accurate and generally cheaper, compared to the same jobs done by “experts”. Local based monitoring also serves a transparent form of monitoring, includes local level capacity building, raises environmental awareness at local level and motivates for further environmental conservation. Not the least, through the direct involvement of local stakeholders, local monitoring provides an opportunity for employment and source of income.

Options for indirect measurements and monitoring of proxies of REDD+ were presented and discussed. The extent of forest degradation is, for example, not detectable by means of remote sensing methods, but indirect methods may provide way forward, e.g. by measuring intact vs. non-intact forest.

Research and knowledge gaps

There are various challenges associated with correctly estimating carbon stocks mainly related to reducing error terms of biomass expansion factors, below-ground carbon (soil and roots) and biomass-to-carbon conversions. Current knowledge about these factors is very limited for many of the important and relevant ecosystems, particularly in tropical and sub-tropical regions. Therefore, considerably more research and funding would be needed to close these knowledge gaps. In addition, estimating the reduction of carbon stocks due to forest degradation poses another important challenge as definitions, thresholds and measuring approaches differ widely from country to country. The search for easy and cost-effective parameters is ongoing and also requires much more research.

Main challenges and key controversial issues

Despite the fact that many pilot projects on measuring forests and its carbon content have shown promising results, the overall capacity to carry out such inventories at the national level in developing countries is still very limited. More efforts during the readiness process (Phase 1 and Phase 2) are needed to enhance the capacities at all levels, in order to arrive at reliable inventory results.

Issues raised in the MRV session were presented to the panel in the closing session for comments (see section 6 for panel debate):

As experiences have shown there is still limited capacity in developing countries for meaningful carbon MRV and monitoring and reporting on other aspects of forests and ecosystem goods and services. Therefore, it is proposed to accept - as a start - simplified result-based monitoring, reporting and verification processes (e.g. monitoring of forest area in Brazil) and simultaneously step up efforts in capacity building during the ongoing REDD+ readiness phase.

Participatory community monitoring of forests in the context of REDD+ is seen as a promising approach to large-scale monitoring at the national level. From the discussions in the MRV session, it transpired that participatory community assessments should not be applied for carbon stocks measurement at national level, but could be a cost-effective way of assessing and monitoring broader forest related aspects on forest degradation and co-benefits such as food, wildlife, water, and biodiversity.

4. Thematic session II – Biodiversity co-benefits

The session was chaired by Neil Burgess (World Wildlife Fund) and provided the following presentations:

- Introduction by facilitator Neil Burgess, World Wildlife Fund.
- Lera Miles, United Nations Environment Programme -World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Title of presentation: Safeguarding biodiversity under REDD+.
- Jill Blockhus, The Nature Conservancy. Title of presentation: Designing a sub-national district-wide REDD program.
- Ian Rowland, Royal Society for Protection of Birds. Title of presentation: Not just carbon: biodiversity's place in REDD+
- Annalisa Savaresi, Faculty of Law, University of Copenhagen. Title of presentation: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation in Developing Countries Under the UNFCCC - Caveats and Opportunities for Biodiversity.

The speakers presented work regarding development of biodiversity safeguards and co-benefits in relation to the UN-REDD and CBD as well as two conservation/REDD+ projects led by The Nature Conservancy and the Royal Society for Protection of Birds.

Main experiences in relation to REDD+

REDD+ currently includes five sets of activities or interventions, namely; i) reducing emissions from deforestation, ii) reducing emissions from forest degradation, iii) conservation of (existing) forest carbon stocks, iv) sustainable management of forests, and v) enhancement of forest carbon stocks (through regeneration and planting). The inclusion of the last two approaches makes it less clear whether biodiversity will gain from REDD+. Displacement was seen as a risk. As different forests have different carbon- and biodiversity values, funds for forests with high C-stocks may push deforestation to forests with lower C-stocks (but potentially high biodiversity values) or into countries not participating in REDD+. Future, large scale funding for REDD+ could possibly sidetrack biodiversity conservation as a goal within tropical forestry. On the other hand afforestation may also create opportunities to connect fragmented landscapes. Much will depend on whether natural forest conservation will remain as a central component in national REDD+ strategies. At international level it was felt that UNFCCC treaty bodies have ignored calls for concerted action within the CBD. At the moment, standards are developed on voluntary basis while waiting for internationally binding rules, which would include the agreed texts on safeguards for biodiversity (and social issues).

Expectations to REDD+

REDD+ started as avoided deforestation (as RED). As about 50% of the world's biodiversity is found in tropical forests avoided deforestation should be unambiguously good for biodiversity. Avoided deforestation would almost automatically target High Biodiversity Value areas and was likely to be hugely important for funding conservation of biodiversity rich areas. Rules and definitions were expected to be developed in accordance with these goals. REDD came from the addition of considerations of forest degradation and the + from enhancement of carbon stocks through regeneration and planting.

Research and knowledge gaps

There was a general acceptance that a lot could be done to secure biodiversity's place in REDD+ based on the technical knowledge already in place. A definition of natural forests is still lacking and was seen as crucial for biodiversity safeguards. Ways to include biodiversity within the proposed monitoring of deforestation and degradation in the cheapest possible way was also an important issue raised.

Main challenges and key controversial issues

Key challenges raised in presentations and/or discussion were the following: Lack of an agreement within UNFCCC that ensures REDD+ will achieve biodiversity safeguards. This includes the development of safeguards text, that will include principles and criteria for measuring the achievement of biodiversity safeguards at national levels.

- Lack of institutional capacity within REDD+ countries and lack of collaboration between institutions complicated by the fact that national implementation of REDD+ takes place in a political setting
- In some instances carbon rich forests are not the most valuable in terms of biodiversity.
- Future, large scale funding for REDD+ could possibly sidetrack biodiversity conservation as a goal within tropical forestry.
- Lack of coordination between REDD+ rules and national forest laws.
- Co-benefits considerations within MRV and evaluation of biodiversity safeguards may be too complicated and countries may drop it altogether.

Participants felt a need for common tools to quantify biodiversity benefits and costs. As REDD+ countries continue to develop their own systems for reporting on biodiversity safeguards, comparison across countries becomes impossible. Also, there is no ways to inform trade-offs between carbon, biodiversity and livelihoods co-benefits. Biodiversity is an intrinsic value and very hard to monetise as opposed to carbon and to some extent livelihood incomes.

This led to the following key question to the panel (see section 6 for panel debate):

- Will a common system for evaluating biodiversity safeguards be developed, and if so who should countries report to and who is going to pay for it?

5. Thematic session III – Livelihood co-benefits

The thematic session was chaired by Iben Nathan (Forest & Landscape Denmark) and provided the following presentations:

- Introduction by Iben Nathan, Forest & Landscape Denmark
- Wali Adeleke, International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Ghana. Title: Building pro-poor REDD national strategies – experience from Ghana.
- Gernot Brodnig, World Bank. Title: Benefit sharing and carbon rights in REDD+.
- Thomas Blomley, Acacia Natural Resource Consultants Ltd.. Title: Lessons not learned?: What three decades of community forestry experience can teach us about REDD+.
- Jagdish Poudel, the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development Nepal. Title: Contouring forest carbon payment through community forestry.
- Rounding up

Livelihood co-benefits are envisaged as part and parcel of REDD+ strategies. REDD+ design and operation should ensure that carbon finance and benefits reach often poor forest dependent people and indigenous people. Thus, the issues associated with payment mechanism, benefit sharing and opportunities for sustainable development were considered.

Main experiences in relation to REDD+

Drawing on the case from Ghana, Mr. Wali Adeleke from IUCN emphasized that REDD+ should ensure “good” governance (i.e. transparency, participation and equity etc.) and that appropriate consultation processes should take place in both design and implementation of a national REDD+ strategy.

Mr. Gernot Brodnig from the World Bank emphasized the importance of clarifying key issues concerning benefit sharing. These included the questions of “what are benefits and costs for implementing REDD+”, “who are eligible for the benefits and who should bear the costs” and “how the benefits and costs should be distributed”.

Mr. Thomas Blomley from Acacia Natural Resource Consultants Ltd. drew upon various lessons from community forestry initiatives for the successful implementation of REDD+. Among others, he highlighted the importance of securing communities’ tenure rights over forests and autonomy in rule making, and ensuring good governance and pro-poor safeguards at the local level, equitable benefit sharing, and their involvement in Monitoring, Re-

porting and Verification (MRV).

Mr. Jagdish Poudel from the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development Nepal described his experience with involving communities in a REDD+ pilot project in Nepal. He explained how the communities had been involved in REDD related activities and how payments have been distributed to the community level.

Expectations to REDD+

The session speakers acknowledged that there is a critical need to effectively and equitably involve the forest dependent poor and vulnerable in REDD+ implementation and benefit sharing and discussed how this could be realized in practice.

An audience noted that REDD+ activities should also take “risks” into consideration and how these risks should be shared among concerned actors. Another audience urged that REDD-activities should go beyond payments (compensating for opportunity costs) and entail investment for productive activities that generate sufficient forest related income. This is to avoid the risk that those who protect and conserve forests lose interests in doing so when payments are stopped. A last comment was concerned with the initial high expectations: While these expectations are likely to help REDD+ to become a key agenda within the climate change negotiations, they also carry the risk of leading to disappointment among involved parties due to lengthy negotiations and delays in actual implementation.

Main challenges and knowledge gaps

The main challenges identified during the session were condensed into the following questions for the panel (see section 6 for panel debate):

- Who are responsible for meeting all the expectations created in the REDD process with regard to funds and activities?
- What are appropriate forms of engagement by the forest dependent people in policy and rule making, and right, benefit, cost and risk sharing?
- What are appropriate forms of involving forest dependent peoples in the UN/WB led REDD initiatives to ensure that REDD benefits reach the poor?
- How can REDD be designed in a way to cover upfront high investment cost for REDD activities, also to make sure that REDD benefits exceed these costs?

6. Closing session

The five key-note speakers; Andreas Tveteraas, Yemi Katarere, Gerhard Dieterle, Joji Carino and Steven Panfil formed the panel for a plenum discussion. To encourage the discussion, the facilitators of the thematic sessions raised a number of questions/issues that summarised the thematic sessions.

Thematic session I – Measuring, Reporting and Verification

Issues presented to the panel:

- As experiences have shown there is still limited capacity in developing countries for meaningful carbon MRV and monitoring and reporting on other aspects of forests and ecosystem goods and services. Therefore, it is proposed to accept - as a start - simplified result-based monitoring, reporting and verification processes (e.g. monitoring of forest area in Brazil) and simultaneously step up efforts in capacity building during the ongoing REDD+ readiness phase.
- Participatory community monitoring of forests in the context of REDD+ is seen as a promising approach to large-scale monitoring at the national level. From the discussions in the MRV session, it transpired that participatory community assessments should not be applied for carbon stocks measurement at national level, but could be a cost-effective way of assessing and monitoring broader forest related aspects on forest degradation and co-benefits such as food, wildlife, water, and biodiversity.

Responses from the panel:

- The first phase of REDD+ is primarily a readiness phase concerned with issues of capacity and underlying factors of deforestation. Rewarding for avoided deforestation will not be a priority in this phase but in the later part of phase two or early phase three.
- There is a need for simplified MRV given the low capacity in MRV. Building result-based partnerships is a potential strategy. This is already working in Brazil where forest area changes are detected but not carbon changes. In Guyana this approach is taken a step further to include also proxies for degradation. The same approach might be used also in Indonesia. Country circumstances need to be considered, country by country.
- The phases-approach of REDD+ is a good way of looking at the MRV requirements. In a phase 3, large requirements are needed, but where we are now, we are mainly talking about proxy measurements, capacity building etc. Things are moving slowly in developing countries and will take time.
- With regard to community based measurements, forests managed by communities are much better protected, suggesting that communities will also be the best to monitor improvements in forest management. However, it should be done within a national framework.

Thematic session II – Biodiversity co-benefits

Question posed to the panel:

- Will a common system for evaluating biodiversity safeguards be developed, and if so who should countries report to and who is going to pay for it?

Responses from the panel:

- Yes countries will be asked to report on safeguards under UNFCCC, which will include biodiversity
- They may use the same biodiversity information to report to CBD as well
- The work will be paid from within overall REDD+ funding mechanisms, assuming these are agreed under UNFCCC
- A common system for reporting on biodiversity safeguards does not exist and its development is linked to the development and elaboration and agreement of the safeguards text within UNFCCC REDD+ negotiations. In the meantime there are voluntary standards (e.g CCBA) which can be used by countries in their ‘readiness processes’

Thematic session III – Livelihood co-benefits

Question posed to the panel:

- Who are responsible for meeting all the expectations created in the REDD process with regard to funds and activities?
- What are appropriate forms of engagement by the forest dependent people in policy and rule making, and right, benefit, cost and risk sharing?
- What are appropriate forms of involving forest dependent peoples in the UN/WB led REDD initiatives to ensure that REDD benefits reach the poor?
- How can REDD be designed in a way to cover upfront high investment cost for REDD activities, also to make sure that REDD benefits exceed these costs?

Responses from the panel:

- Carbon is not enough alone. Carbon can only be an additional benefit. Prices on carbon are fluctuating and buyers might be gone tomorrow.
- We all have responsibility for REDD. We have to communicate that REDD should benefit all groups but not all countries equally. There has been this feeling that there is a lot of money. Some think that the payments for readiness should go to local communities. But we should communicate clearly so that people have balanced expectations
- Money going directly to communities does actually make a lot of improvement. Very little money is going these days to developing communities.
- Concern was expressed about the high expectations; Money will be di-

rected towards initiatives to address drivers of deforestation. Indigenous peoples may not necessarily receive any of these payments. It is worth remembering that the D in REDD does not stand for Deserved. REDD payments will to some extent be used to pay the 'bad guys' for stopping their deforestation activities.

Niels Elers Koch (Forest & Landscape Denmark) gave the closing remarks.

Appendix I

Joint morning session (Plenary room III)

A series of keynote speakers from international organisations involved in REDD+ including the World Bank and the UN-REDD programme as well as representatives of Non-Governmental Organisations and indigenous peoples will introduce the main topics of the seminar.

Chair: Mike Speirs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

Opening

- 08.30 – 09.00: Registration, coffee and croissants
- 09.00 – 09.15: Opening remarks by Niels Elers Koch, Forest & Landscape Denmark
- 09.15 – 09.30: Ib Petersen, State secretary for Development Policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

Key-note speakers

- 09.30 – 10.00: Andreas Tveteraas, The Norwegian Climate and Forest Initiative
- 10.00 – 10.30: Yemi Katerere, UN-REDD Programme. Title: *REDD+: A Unique Opportunity?*
- 10.30 – 11.00: Coffee break
- 11.00 – 11.30: Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank. Title: *“Global Demands - local needs” - widening the scope of forest-based climate mitigation options in the tropics*
- 11.30 – 12.00: Joji Carino, United Nations Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity. Title: *Indigenous peoples’ experiences and expectations on REDD+*
- 12.00 – 12.30: Steven Panfil, REDD+ Initiative at Conservation International. Title: *Linking REDD+ projects to emerging national REDD+ programs*
- 12.30 – 13.15: Lunch

Thematic afternoon sessions

Critical REDD+ concerns will be presented and discussed in three thematic afternoon sessions. Coffee and tea will be available during these sessions.

Measuring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)

The session will examine the challenges associated with measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) of forest carbon emissions. A central building block of the REDD+ mechanism, considerable work has been carried out to design effective MRV systems. The role of different actors in these processes and the scope of MRV systems will be analysed based on experiences from different locations.

Facilitator: Michael Kleine, International Union of Forest Research Organisations.

- 13.15 – 13.20: Introduction by facilitator Michael Kleine, International Union of Forest Research Organizations
- 13.20 – 13.50: Danilo Mollicone, UN-REDD Programme, Food and Agriculture Organisation. Title: *Information, monitoring and MRV in the context of REDD+*
- 13.50 – 14.20: Herizo Andrianandrasana, Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust Madagascar. Title: *Effectiveness of local REDD+ monitoring in Madagascar*
- 14.20 – 14.50: Klaus Dons, Forest & Landscape Denmark. Title: *Direct and indirect approaches to monitor forest degradation in dry forests in Tanzania*
- 14.50 – 15.20: Louis Verchot, Center for International Forestry Research. Title: *Accounting for carbon emissions from tropical land use change: constraints with emissions factors required to operationalize IPCC equations*
- 15.20 – 15.30: Rounding up

II. Biodiversity co-benefits

The session will consider the conservation of biological diversity in connection with the establishment of REDD+ schemes. The challenges associated with enhancing biodiversity conservation using a mechanism which focuses on carbon sequestration will be explored.

Facilitator: Neil Burgess, World Wildlife Fund.

- 13.15 – 13.20: Introduction by facilitator Neil Burgess, World Wildlife Fund
- 13.20 – 13.50: Lera Miles, United Nations Environment Programme -World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Title: *Safeguarding biodiversity under REDD+*
- 13.50 – 14.20: Jill Blockhus, The Nature Conservancy. Title: *Designing a sub-national district-wide REDD program*
- 14.20 – 14.50: Ian Rowland, Royal Society for Protection of Birds. Title: *Not just carbon: biodiversity's place in REDD+*
- 14.50 – 15.20: Annalisa Savaresi, Faculty of Law, University of Copenhagen. Title: *Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries under the UNFCCC - caveats and opportunities for biodiversity*
- 15.20 – 15.30: Rounding up

III. Livelihood co-benefits

Livelihood co-benefits are envisaged as part and parcel of REDD+ strategies. REDD+ design and operation should ensure that carbon finance and benefits reach often poor forest dependent people and indigenous peoples. Thus, the issues associated with payment mechanism, benefit sharing and opportunities for sustainable development will be considered.

Facilitator: Iben Nathan, Forest & Landscape Denmark.

- 13.15 – 13.20: Introduction by facilitator Iben Nathan, Forest & Landscape Denmark
- 13.20 – 13.50: Wali Adeleke, International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Ghana. Title: *Building pro-poor REDD national strategies – experience from Ghana*
- 13.50 – 14.20: Gernot Brodnig, World Bank. Title: *Benefit sharing and carbon rights in REDD+*
- 14.20 – 14.50: Thomas Blomley, Acacia Natural Resource Consultants Ltd.. Title: *Lessons not learned?: What three decades of community forestry experience can teach us about REDD+*
- 14.50 – 15.20: Jagdish Poudel, the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development Nepal. Title: *Contouring forest carbon payment through community forestry*
- 15.20 – 15.30: Rounding up

Closing session

15.45 – 16.30: Panel discussion. Chair: Elsebeth Tarp, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

Participants:

- Andreas Tveteraas, The Norwegian Climate and Forest Initiative
- Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank
- Steven Panfil, REDD Programme Conservation International
- Joji Carino, United Nations Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
- Yemi Katerere, UN-REDD Programme

16.30 – 16.40: Closing remarks by Niels Elers Koch, Forest & Landscape Denmark